

In re Appln of Zeev ZALEVSKY et al
Application No. 10/575,565
Reply to Office Action of September 29, 2009
Response to Requirement filed March 16, 2010

claim under any possible conditions. Even if Applicants do not have a generic claim at the present time, Applicants do not agree that they would be prohibited from presenting a generic claim on the basis of the present election of what is identified as Species I. Applicants respectfully maintain that a generic claim can be rejected by the PTO on the basis of prior art or some other statutory basis, but not that Applicants can be prevented from pursuing a generic claim, if Applicants choose to do so. Applicants assume, based on the bottom paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action, and also the first complete paragraph on page 5 of the Office Action, that the PTO does not disagree with Applicants' position.


Other than as expressed above, Applicants do not traverse the requirement. Applicants agree with the PTO holding that the claims which read on the elected subject matter are claims 1-72 and 82-88.

Applicants now respectfully await the results of an examination on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicants

By

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'S. Neimark', written over a horizontal line.

Sheridan Neimark
Registration No. 20,520

SN:ltm
G:\BN\C\cohn\Zalevsky5\Pto\2010-03-26 election.doc
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197